Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached six (6) sheets of formal drawings replace all informal drawing sheets previously on file, and include Figures 1 to 8. No changes to Figures 1 to 8 have been made.

Attachment: Replacement sheets of Formal Drawings.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Ito (US 4,946,346). Ito teaches a gas turbine vane having an airfoil 21 with a central cavity 24 within which is disposed a guide cylinder 25 through which cooling air flows to enter the vane assembly before being directed outward therefrom to the vane airfoil 21 via impingement holes 26 and downstream fine holes 27. Once such cooling air has circulated through the airfoil, it is fed into upper and lower flow path passages 31 and 32 of the upper end wall 23 and the lower end wall 23 respectively. Once the cooling air has finally made its way into these flow path passages 31 and 32 within the upper and lower end walls, it can be directed through holes 35 and 36 into the gas path. Accordingly, although some effusion cooling is provided by the air flowing through holes 35 and 36, this cooling air has already been used to cool the inner portions of the airfoil, and therefore is much less effective in providing efficient effusion cooling of the platforms.

Claims 1-11 were also rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious in view of Beeck et al (US 6,565,317). Beeck et al. teach a turbine blade 4 having a platform 3 integrally formed at the root base thereof, the platform 3 having an outer surface 2 through which so called blow-out orifices 12 extend. These orifices 12 are in communication with a plenum, such as plenum 10 or plenum 30 which is supplied air from the main plenum 5 through feed ducts 6, defined within the turbine blade platform 3. These plenums collect cooling air before flowing through the orifices 12, and are said to provide *convective* cooling across the *entire* platform. Thus, the cooling air is at least partially heated by such convective cooling which occurs within the plenums before passing outwards into the gas path via the orifices 12, which considerably reduces the effectiveness of the effusion cooling effect provided by the orifices 12 on the outer surface of the platform.

In view of the above comments and amended independent claims 1, 7 and 11, these rejections are now believed to be moot. At least in view of their dependence on claim 1, 7 and 11, claims 2-6, 8-10 and new claim 12 are also believed to be both novel and inventive over both Ito and Beeck et al. Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-11 as being anticipated by Ito and rendered obvious by Beeck et al. is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 7 and 11 as presently amended are fully supported by the specification as filed, for example as described in paragraphs [0020] and [0027] and with reference to Figs. 4 and 8. The subject matter of amended claim 2 and new claim 12 is also fully supported by the specification as filed, for example in

paragraph [0023] and in Fig. 6. Therefore no new subject matter has been added.

Applicant would like the Examiner to confirm that the Information Disclosure Statement filed February 2, 2005 has been considered.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully,

May 9, 2005
Date

Agent of the Applicant
T. James Reid, Reg. No. 56,498
OGILVY RENAULT
1981 McGill College, Suite 1600
Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3A 2Y3
Tel.: (514) 847-4311